

Pamy T.C. Kuo

Partner

Family Law

+852 2186 1861

pamy.kuo@oln-law.com



Profile

Pamy qualified as a solicitor in Hong Kong in 2003 and have always been passionate about Family and Matrimonial Law.

Pamy joined one of the most well-established family and matrimonial law firms in Hong Kong as a Trainee Solicitor and was then retained as an Associate Solicitor after her traineeship, where she began her specialisation in Family and Matrimonial Law. In 2006, Pamy joined the [Family Law Department](#) at OLN as an Associate Solicitor and was made a Partner in 2015. Pamy is a Fellow of the [International Academy of Family Lawyers](#) ("IAFL"). IAFL is a worldwide association of practising lawyers who are recognised by their peers as the most experienced and skilled family law specialists in their respective countries.

Pamy was educated in Hong Kong and the UK. With her trilingual language abilities, dedication in Family and Matrimonial Law and vast experience and knowledge in dealing with wide range of family disputes involving multiple jurisdictions, divorce, children, finances and trusts, Pamy has attracted clients from local, mainland China and overseas.

Pamy has particular expertise in handling jurisdictional cases which involve complex corporate and financial structures and trusts. Pamy was the handling solicitor for the leading reported jurisdictional cases as set out below in her notable cases.

Pamy also focuses on matters involving children, not only on custody, care and control issues but also on relocation of them. Pamy has a real passion in cases concerning children for both married family as well as for children born out of wedlock such as one of her notable cases set out below.

Pamy also has particular expertise in cases involving pre- and post-nuptial agreements as well as separation agreements which often involve high net worth individuals with their trust arrangements and assets located in multiple jurisdictions.

Admissions and Memberships

Since 2003 - Solicitor, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

Since 2010 - Member of the Hong Kong Family Law Association (FLA)

Since 2012 - Civil Celebrant of Marriages in Hong Kong

Since 2024 - Fellow of the International Academy of Family Lawyers (IAFL)

Notable Cases

TO also know as TT v KO (Jurisdiction; Habitual Residence)

[2021] HKFLR 554

Pamy, as the handling Partner, successfully represented the Respondent Husband in the first instance and on appeal, in a big-money divorce to dismiss the Hong Kong divorce proceedings for lack of jurisdiction as Hong Kong was not either party's habitual residence. Both parties are Japanese. The Respondent Husband has a very successful casino business in the Philippines. He set up a corporate structure in Hong Kong to manage the business and his art collections. The family moved to and lived in Hong Kong for 8 years. The Court of Appeal dismissed the Petitioner Wife's appeal given at the time of the Petition for Divorce, the Respondent Husband was spending 2/3 of his time in the Philippines and the remaining 1/3 time equally between Hong Kong and Japan, whilst the Petitioner Wife had spent increasingly more time in Japan than Hong Kong during the three years prior to the Petition despite obtaining HKPR. There was therefore insufficient degree of continuity in the purpose of living in Hong Kong for it to be described as settled.

Z v Z (Substantial Connection and Forum [2012] HKFLR 346)

Pamy successfully represented the Respondent Husband in this big-money divorce to dismiss the Hong Kong divorce proceedings for lack of jurisdiction or forum non conveniens. The Petitioner Wife is Japanese and the Respondent Husband is American. The parties were married in Japan but 7 years into the marriage, the Respondent Husband moved his base to New York due to work and would return to Japan to visit the Petitioner Wife and children on weekends. At the time of the Petition, the Husband had already moved out from the family home in Japan and relocated to Shanghai. The Hong Kong Court held that the Petitioner Wife did not establish that either party had a substantial connection to Hong Kong because notwithstanding the Respondent Husband's substantial business interests in Hong Kong, he had led a nomadic lifestyle and his presence in Hong Kong was only transient, and the issues of children were best dealt with in Japan where the matrimonial life was conducted.

RI v SSH (Forum and Costs) [2011] HKFLR 318

Pamy successfully represented the Petitioner Wife in a divorce and a GMO proceedings in the Hong Kong Court where the Respondent Husband filed parallel divorce in France and sought to stay the Hong Kong proceedings on the basis of forum non conveniens. It was a typical expatriate family case where the Respondent Husband and the children were French and the Petitioner Wife was Indonesian. The family had lived in many different countries due to work arrangements and at the time of Petition, they had only lived in Hong Kong for a few months. The family sold their last matrimonial home in Belgium when they moved to Hong Kong and the children were then enrolled in schools here. It was also the Respondent Husband's intention to set up business in Hong Kong. At first instance, the Court found that France was not the more appropriate forum than Hong Kong as the parties had not lived their matrimonial life there notwithstanding there was a connection to France. The Court of Appeal dismissed the Respondent Husband's appeal and upheld the lower Court decision that the parties had established a real and substantial connection to Hong Kong as it was the place where they were living their matrimonial life at the time of the Petition.

B v A (Substantial Connection) [2007] HKFLP 138

Pamy successfully represented the Petitioner Wife in a contested divorce where the Respondent

Husband disputed the Hong Kong Court's jurisdiction on the basis of the Petitioner Wife's lack of substantial connection. Both the Petitioner Wife and the Respondent Husband were expatriates from Argentina travelling extensively around the globe due to work arrangements. At the time of the Petition, the Petitioner Wife had been living in Hong Kong for 5 to 6 months with the children of the family who were enrolled in the international schools here, and had taken a 2-year lease on an apartment. Based on these facts, the Petitioner Wife was held to have established substantial connection to Hong Kong as the family had centred their lives in Hong Kong with the children being educated and the Respondent Husband running an office here, and there was therefore an intention to remain in Hong Kong for a fairly extended period of time.

Y, M v S, J [2022] HKFC 250

Pamy represents the Mother in a set of GMO proceedings to seek financial provisions from the Father for the benefits of a minor born out of wedlock. The Father and Mother are both expats living and working in Hong Kong. The Father comes from a well-off family which operates, through a Hong Kong listed company, a large business in Japan as well as a subsidiary aircraft leasing business with companies in Hong Kong and overseas in which the Father is a director.

Awards

2026

Chambers Greater China Region

Family / Matrimonial

Doyle's Guide

Hong Kong – Leading Family & Divorce Lawyers – Recommended Lawyer

2025

The Legal 500 Asia Pacific

Private Client and Family - Recommended Lawyer

2024

The Legal 500 Asia Pacific

Private Client and Family - Recommended Lawyer